REMARKS

Claims 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,150,076) (hereinafter: "Yamamoto") and over Yamamoto in view of Sales (U.S. Patent No. 5,169,888).

The Office has not provided a reasonable explanation of the bases for rejection such that applicants can properly respond to the rejection. Thus, for example, the claims of the present application are directed to a process for producing an aqueous resin dispersion composition. Yamamoto is directed to a process for treating the periphery of an unexposed photosensitive resin plate. The Office has not explained where Yamamoto discloses the preparation of an aqueous resin dispersion composition. A photosensitive resin composition is not inherently an aqueous resin dispersion composition.

Also, the resin of the aqueous resin dispersion composition used in the process of the present invention is an acid-modified chlorinated polyolefin. Yamamoto discloses the use of a chlorinated polyethylene as one of the components, i.e., hydrophobic polymer (A), to be used together with other required components, i.e., hydrophilic polymer (B), in the photosensitive resin compositions useful in its invention, but does not

specifically disclose an acid-modified chlorinated polyolefin. The disclosure of "generically all chlorinated polyethylenes" as alleged in the Action is not the disclosure of an acid-modified chlorinated polyolefin.

The Office has also failed to explain how it is interpreting the claims of the present application. However, the rejections appear to be based on a very broad interpretation of claims 6-11 of the application. Specifically, it appears that the rejections are based on an interpretation of claim 6 as reading on a method for making any composition which includes an acid-modified chlorinated polyolefin that is combined with an ethereal solvent, a basic substance and water, and as not excluding the presence of other components as required in Yamamoto. Regarding the order of steps required in claim 6, the Office's position is that in the disclosure in Yamamoto, the components of the photosensitive resin composition disclosed therein can be dissolved in any order and mixed in an appropriate solvent, is broad enough to include the order of steps recited in claim 6.

Applicants respectfully submit that the method disclosed in Yamamoto for preparing the photosensitive resin compositions useful in its invention, or as modified by Sales, does not meet the limitations of the method recited in claim 6 of the present

application as examined by the Office. First, it is at best unclear from the disclosure in Col. 7 of Yamamoto that "the above-described components of the photosensitive resin composition are dissolved in any order and mixed in an appropriate solvent or component (D)" (lines 26-29), which indicates that all of the components of the photosensitive resin composition are added to a solvent or solvents at the same time, can be reasonably interpreted as including a process where an acid-modified chlorinated polyolefin is dissolved in an ethereal solvent and is then added to water.

Second, Yamamoto discloses that the solvent (i.e., all solvents including water) is removed. Nowhere is it disclosed or suggested that an ethereal solvent alone is or can be removed. Claim 6 (prior to the amendment herein) cannot be reasonably interpreted as reading on the removal of both an ethereal solvent and water.

Nothwithstanding the above insufficiencies of Yamamoto, alone or as modified by Sales, to support a case of *prima facie* obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of the process recited in claims 6-11, claim 6 has been amended to exclude components of the aqueous resin dispersion other than the acid-modified chlorinated polyolefin, basic substance and water. Amended claim 6 recites a

"process for producing an aqueous resin dispersion composition consisting essentially of an acid-modified chlorinated polyolefin, basic substance and water and without the use of an emulsifier" and, therefore, excludes non-recited components that would be expected to affect the basic characteristics of the aqueous resin dispersion composition.

Claim 6 has also been amended to specifically recite that the ethereal solvent is removed to obtain the aqueous resin dispersion.

Finally, it is noted that notwithstanding any *prima facie* obviousness alleged by the Office to be supported by Yamamoto, alone or as modified by Sales, the showing in the Declaration (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132) of Tatsuo TSUNEKA submitted with the response of May 22, 2006, of the criticality of the process sequence recited in claims 6-11 of the present application is sufficient to demonstrate the unobviousness of the process of the present invention. Consideration of this showing is requested.

Removal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of the claims is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete and proper response to the Office Action dated May 30, 2007, and is believed to place this application in condition for allowance. If, however, minor issues remain that can be resolved by means of a telephone

interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

In the event that this paper is not considered to be timely filed, applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for any such extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 111833.

In the event any additional fees are required, please also charge our Deposit Account No. 111833.

Respectfully submitted,

KUBOVCIK & KUBOVCIK

Ronald J. Kubovcik
Reg. No. 25,401

Atty. Case No. SAE-036
The Farragut Building
Suite 710
900 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
Tel: (202) 887-9023
Fax: (202) 887-9093
RJK/JBF